To: DeCair, Sara[DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
From: Cunningham, William C
Sent: Tue 8/18/2015 2:31:59 PM
Subject: Edited Q/A for food/water
FDA-EPA-PAG Aug 2015.docx

Sara,

Please see the attached.

(edited answers to questions 5 and 6 plus one that could address the "double-dosing" concern)

Thanks,

Bill

William (Bill) Cunningham, PhD

Regulatory Review Scientist / Research Chemist

Office of Regulatory Science (HFS-716)

Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition

U.S. Food and Drug Administration

301-975-6271

To: DeCair, Sara[DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
From: Cunningham, William C
Sent: Mon 8/17/2015 1:33:19 PM
Subject: RE: Ok to add to water proposal?

Sara,

Sounds good. My schedule is open all day.

Thanks,

Bill

From: DeCair, Sara [mailto:DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2015 9:30 AM
To: Cunningham, William C
Subject: Re: Ok to add to water proposal?

Bill, these are currently being used for internal briefing purposes based on questions we've gotten from mgmt. the double-counting of water potential confusion is what I may want to address directly in the chapter. Do you have any time to talk tomorrow? I'll be in the office and able to show you more of what I'm working on, maybe webinar, my fave collaboration tool - let me know if you have open times if you would? Thx!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 17, 2015, at 9:04 AM, Cunningham, William C <William.Cunningham@fda.hhs.gov> wrote:

> Sara,
>
> Question 5 asks why do we need a water PAG when FDA already has one for food (which could logically include water)
>
> Question 6 asks how FDA's and EPA's PAGs differ.

These are very different questions than the recurring "double-dosing" questions.

I need to know whether we need to draft answers to these questions or if these are suggestions on how to address the underlying double-dose dilemma.

Thanks,

Bill

From: DeCair, Sara [mailto:DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2015 8:38 AM
To: Cunningham, William C
Subject: Re: Ok to add to water proposal?

Super!

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 13, 2015, at 6:34 AM, Cunningham, William C <William.Cunningham@fda.hhs.gov> wrote:

> Sara,
>
> I'll need to 'play' with it a little then bounce through Pat Hansen. I'll try to get back to you on Monday.
>
> Bill
>
> **From:** DeCair, Sara [mailto:DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
> **Sent:** Wednesday, August 12, 2015 4:07 PM

To: Cunningham, William C; Cunningham, William C
Cc: Noska, Michael A
Subject: Ok to add to water proposal?

Bill,

Here are some internal Q&As that we did to answer management questions during the water PAG process…. But it appears everyone asks the water in food question, so we might have to put one or more of these sentences in the proposed water chapter. Would you check if any of this needs editing, or if it is all true? Any input you have is appreciated, so I can get to OMB soon!

Question 5: FDA already has a PAG for food of 500 mrem. Why did EPA just propose/publish a drinking water PAG of 500 mrem?

Answer: EPA's drinking water PAG is designed to limit risk due to radiological contamination of the drinking water supply. The FDA food PAG accounts for food ingestion and considers how water may be used in the preparation of some types of food products or how radionuclides transported through water might end up deposited in crops and ultimately enter the food supply (like milk or vegetables).

Because a radiological event may result in contamination of food, water, or both, a strict delineation between the two ingestion routes may not be straightforward. FDA and EPA PAGs and procedures are complementary and can be adapted to apply to the specifics of a given situation. Due to inherent differences in how the food and water supplies are protected, the intervention/response levels for food and water differ.

Question 6: What is the difference between the FDA Food PAG and EPA's Drinking Water PAG?

Answer: They both are implemented using "derived levels" called DILs and DRLs. There are two things to understand about the relationship between the FDA's Food PAG and EPA drinking water PAG; 1) They take water into account in different ways (food preparation vs. drinking water consumption) and 2) Decision makers can use both sets of guidance as appropriate for the specifics of the emergency at hand.

The FDA Food PAG was developed with a primary focus on responding to contamination events affecting the food supply. The EPA drinking water PAG was developed with a focus on responding to contamination events affecting the drinking water supply. The FDA DILs include a water component in the calculations (as part of the mass of the total diet) even though it is not regulated by FDA. Correspondingly, the EPA DRL calculations used survey data about tap water usage which includes drinking water intake as well as water added to beverages, and water added to foods during preparation, but not water intrinsic in food as purchased. This allows the DIL and DRL calculations to account for the possibility that exposure could come from both ingestion routes (food and water).

Sara D. DeCair

http://www.epa.gov/radiation/rert/pags.html

202-343-9108

Room 1416 B in WJC West

To: DeCair, Sara[DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
Cc: Noska, Michael A[Michael.Noska@fda.hhs.gov]
From: Cunningham, William C
Sent: Fri 8/14/2015 5:44:43 PM
Subject: RE: Ok to add to water proposal?

Sara,

These questions are rather specific and target different issues than we've worked on before so I need to know whether these are THE questions or are they just suggested questions?

Thanks,

Bill

From: DeCair, Sara [mailto:DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 4:07 PM
To: Cunningham, William C; Cunningham, William C
Cc: Noska, Michael A
Subject: Ok to add to water proposal?

Bill,

Here are some internal Q&As that we did to answer management questions during the water PAG process…. But it appears everyone asks the water in food question, so we might have to put one or more of these sentences in the proposed water chapter. Would you check if any of this needs editing, or if it is all true? Any input you have is appreciated, so I can get to OMB soon!

Question 5: FDA already has a PAG for food of 500 mrem. Why did EPA just propose/publish a drinking water PAG of 500 mrem?

Answer: EPA's drinking water PAG is designed to limit risk due to radiological contamination of the drinking water supply. The FDA food PAG accounts for food

ingestion and considers how water may be used in the preparation of some types of food products or how radionuclides transported through water might end up deposited in crops and ultimately enter the food supply (like milk or vegetables).

Because a radiological event may result in contamination of food, water, or both, a strict delineation between the two ingestion routes may not be straightforward. FDA and EPA PAGs and procedures are complementary and can be adapted to apply to the specifics of a given situation. Due to inherent differences in how the food and water supplies are protected, the intervention/response levels for food and water differ.

Question 6: What is the difference between the FDA Food PAG and EPA's Drinking Water PAG?

Answer: They both are implemented using "derived levels" called DILs and DRLs. There are two things to understand about the relationship between the FDA's Food PAG and EPA drinking water PAG; 1) They take water into account in different ways (food preparation vs. drinking water consumption) and 2) Decision makers can use both sets of guidance as appropriate for the specifics of the emergency at hand.

The FDA Food PAG was developed with a primary focus on responding to contamination events affecting the food supply. The EPA drinking water PAG was developed with a focus on responding to contamination events affecting the drinking water supply. The FDA DILs include a water component in the calculations (as part of the mass of the total diet) even though it is not regulated by FDA. Correspondingly, the EPA DRL calculations used survey data about tap water usage which includes drinking water intake as well as water added to beverages, and water added to foods during preparation, but not water intrinsic in food as purchased. This allows the DIL and DRL calculations to account for the possibility that exposure could come from both ingestion routes (food and water).

Sara D. DeCair

http://www.epa.gov/radiation/rert/pags.html

202-343-9108

Room 1416 B in WJC West

Question 5: FDA already has a PAG for food of 500 mrem. Why did EPA just propose/publish a drinking water PAG of 500 mrem?

Answer: EPA needed to propose/publish a drinking water PAG because EPA's regulatory responsibilities are separate from FDA's. Whereas the FDA food PAG is relevant for food, EPA's drinking water PAG accounts for the drinking water supply.

The water and food ingestion routes are inherently related because water may be used in the preparation of some food products and radionuclides in water will affect crops and ultimately enter the food supply. However, a strict delineation between the water and food ingestion routes is not straightforward and there are inherent differences in how the food and water supplies are protected. As a result, the intervention/response levels for water and food differ. Once an event occurs and the actual contamination levels are known, risk assessments will show whether new calculations are needed.

Question 6: What is the difference between the FDA Food PAG and EPA's Drinking Water PAG?

Answer: The only difference between the FDA Food PAG and EPA's Drinking Water PAG is technical in that the EPA PAG is based on newer definitions of dosimetry. There is no difference in protection because the underlying objective for both is to assure individuals will have no significant health risk from ingesting radioactive contamination.

In implementation, the FDA and EPA PAGs provide protection in the same manner (i.e., via "derived levels" referred to as FDA DILs and EPA DRLs) but water is must be taken into account in different ways. The FDA DIL calculations include water as part of the total diet even though FDA does not regulate it. Correspondingly, the EPA DRL calculations account for water added to beverages and to foods during preparation (but not water intrinsic in food) even though EPA does not regulate these. As such, these two approaches are from different perspectives but both account for the possibility that exposure could come from both ingestion routes (food and water). In application, these are pre-set derived intervention levels that are always subject to change should risk assessments show different calculations are needed.

Question X: Since FDA and EPA each has a PAG of 500 mrem, is it possible for someone to get 500 mrem from food AND 500 mrem from water?

Answer: No, this is not possible. Two PAGs were established because FDA's and EPA's regulatory responsibilities are separate but the two Agencies work closely in radiological response and recovery planning. Should a major radiological event occur, both Agencies will conduct detailed risk assessments with follow-up efforts being coordinated to account for all ingested contamination. The 500 mrem PAG will therefore not be reached whether via food, water, or both.

In the immediate aftermath of a major event, the pre-set intervention level guidelines are designed to keep contamination levels so low that it would take at least a year to reach a significant health risk. This procedure assures that there will be adequate time for risk assessments to occur so that changes can be made if needed.

To: Noska, Michael A[Michael.Noska@fda.hhs.gov]
From: DeCair, Sara
Sent: Thur 6/23/2016 3:16:56 PM
Subject: Quick check but not a rush
EPA PAG Manual (HHS-FDA Comments).docx

Mike, just checking if you saw the FDA comments that were sent over to OMB on the full PAG Manual. (I attached them FYI.) I know you're busy, so I'm just putting one in this email to run past you. I think it's a good add, but it's a bit out of the PAG Manual context and is probably well covered by the footnote links to FDA's pages on KI, FAQs and other medical countermeasures. That is how I'm disposing of the many suggestions to add med countermeasures language.

The suggested addition I'm on the fence about:

When considering KI procurement, search for "potassium iodide" at FDA's website that lists approved drugs: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/drugsatfda/index.cfm

No rush, thanks!!

Sara D. DeCair

http://www.epa.gov/radiation/rert/pags.html

202-343-9108

Room 1416 B in WJC West

To: Bruce Hirschler[bhirschler@crcpd.org]
Cc: Sincek, Jeffrey[Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov]
From: DeCair, Sara
Sent: Fri 5/29/2015 5:32:29 PM
Subject: RE: Updates to A Team pages on CRCPD.org
FAQ hilites.pdf

Bruce, this is great! I highlighted a few spots where a couple edits are needed, in the attached PDF.

On Q2, there are two instances of CDC that can be replaced by FDA.

On Q18, there is an extra "Evans" that you can cut.

In Q19, please change that last sentence to "Remote support for Advisory Team activities is provided from member organization locations across the country."

Thanks a ton for this!

Sara

From: Bruce Hirschler [mailto:bhirschler@crcpd.org]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2015 11:26 AM
To: DeCair, Sara
Subject: RE: Updates to A Team pages on CRCPD.org

Sara,

Thanks for the updates. I've attached attached my first pass at updating the FAQ. It is difficult to edit acrobat files and have them look OK. If you have a copy of this file in Word, it may look

better if we update it and then generate a new pdf file.

Anyway, I've updated the language to reflect the FDA EOC, replaced Lynn with Jeff, and updated the email links. Please let me know if I've missed anything. I have the other changes ready to post to the website, but felt the FAQ should be in good shape before posting anything else. Once the FAQ looks right, I will post the other changes directly to the website for your review.

Thanks again and I look forward to hearing from you.

Bruce Hirschler

CRCPD

From: DeCair, Sara [mailto:DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 28, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Bruce Hirschler
Cc: Sincek, Jeffrey
Subject: Updates to A Team pages on CRCPD.org

Bruce,

I have a couple updates to make the A Team easier to reach. We discovered these items during a special interest session at the conference, of course! On this page: https://www.crcpd.org/ATeam/Ateam.htm, please change this text:

Radiation Studies Branch

Division of Environmental Hazards and Health Effects

National Center for Environmental Health

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

(770) 488-3800

To this text:

Jeffrey A. Sincek

Regional Radiological Health Representative

U.S. Food & Drug Administration

(614) 227-5780 x 1111

Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov

And then when users click on Contact Us, instead of generating an Outlook message to this address: gfn6@cdc.gov

Please have to it go to this address: Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov

Then when users click on FAQ, please update the current two references to "CDC's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) by calling 770-488-7100" to "FDA's Emergency Operations Center (EOC) by calling 866-300-4374" and replacing all instances of this text: "Lynn Evans at 770-488-3656 (e-mail gfn6@cdc.gov)" with this text: "Jeff Sincek at (614) 227-5780 x 1111 (email Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov)."

I'll be glad to review a new draft if you'd like me to, or check the pages when they're posted. Thank you so much for your help,

Sara

Sara D. DeCair

http://www.epa.gov/radiation/rert/pags.html

202-343-9108

Room 1416 B in WJC West

From: DeCair, Sara
Location: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Importance: Normal
Subject: FW: Advisory Team Charter and Con Ops Final Discussion
Start Date/Time: Thur 1/29/2015 2:30:00 PM
End Date/Time: Thur 1/29/2015 7:30:00 PM
NRIA_WorkingDRAFT_20150115.docx
A-team Charter.docx
Advisory Team ConOps-FINAL 5-28-10.doc
FRPCC Charter 2012.docx

Here you go. I am only hearing music so have begged for a passcode that works

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Sincek, Jeffrey [mailto:Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 28, 2015 12:29 PM
To: Sincek, Jeffrey; DeCair, Sara; Mosser, Jennifer; Noska, Michael A; Cherniack, James; Whitcomb, Robert (CDC); Dixon, John E (CDC); Veal, Lee; ATeam-JENSEN, JOHN
Subject: FW: Advisory Team Charter and Con Ops Final Discussion
When: Thursday, January 29, 2015 9:30 AM-2:30 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

FYI and how are your schedules tomorrow?

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Sincek, Jeffrey [mailto:Jeffrey.Sincek@fda.hhs.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 2:36 PM
To: Sincek, Jeffrey; Noska, Michael A; Cherniack, James; Whitcomb, Robert (CDC); Dixon, John E (CDC); Veal, Lee; ATeam-JENSEN, JOHN
Subject: Advisory Team Charter and Con Ops Final Discussion
When: Thursday, January 29, 2015 9:30 AM-2:30 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

All-

This is a working meeting to finalize the Advisory Team charter and con-ops. We will also be including a discussion on a new document which will affect the Advisory Team- the creation of a FEMA task force to the NRIA. I initially thought we could get through the meeting in a few hours, however with the addition of the NRIA task force, we will need a little more time to get in front of this freight train. I am listing the meeting block at 5 hours, from 9:30 to 2:30. We can break for lunch, and if you cannot attend the entire time block you can come and go as necessary. If you would like to include others from your agency feel free. The documents are attached and we are asking that you read ahead and come prepared to put an end to this ongoing project!

Thanks,

Jeff

To: DeCair, Sara[DeCair.Sara@epa.gov]; Hernandez-Quinones, Samuel[Hernandez.Samuel@epa.gov]; Ellis, Jerry[Ellis.Jerry@epa.gov]; Wieder, Jessica[Wieder.Jessica@epa.gov]; Nesky, Anthony[Nesky.Tony@epa.gov]
Cc: Veal, Lee[Veal.Lee@epa.gov]; Perrin, Alan[Perrin.Alan@epa.gov]
From: Christ, Lisa
Sent: Fri 8/21/2015 4:54:07 PM
Subject: RE: Updated Q&A
QA Document 8-18-2015 (3).docx

…
;;;
Thanks All –

A few edits on the revised Q&A…

Lisa

From: DeCair, Sara
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 5:15 PM
To: Hernandez-Quinones, Samuel; Ellis, Jerry; Wieder, Jessica; Nesky, Anthony
Cc: Veal, Lee; Perrin, Alan; Christ, Lisa
Subject: Updated Q&A

I worked with Mike Noska and Bill Cunningham at FDA to edit Questions 5&6, and changed the approach on lucky #13. Please see attached redline for the changes. Some of this language might also serve well in our Comms materials, which are being finished up this week. (Thank you all!)

Sara

Sara D. DeCair

http://www.epa.gov/radiation/rert/pags.html

202-343-9108

Room 1416 B in WJC West

To: Forinash, Betsy[Forinash.Betsy@epa.gov]
From: Veal, Lee
Sent: Wed 12/18/2013 3:42:50 AM
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Kickoff Webinar: Peer Review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (Schedule Changes)
[EXTERNAL] Please facilitate peer review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (reactor release, 2 of 4 messages)
[EXTERNAL] Please facilitate peer review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (fuel pool release, 3 of 4 messages)

Hi Betsy,

Can you please check in with Sara and Jen on who is covering this for us please?

Lee

Lee Ann B. Veal
Director, Center for Radiological Emergency Management
Radiation Protection Division, ORIA, OAR

Office: 202-343-9448
Cell: 202-617-4322

From: Noska, Michael A <Michael.Noska@fda.hhs.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 7:04 PM
To: ATeam-ACKERMAN, DONALD; Allen Jr, George T; Anderson, Jeri L. (CDC); Ansari, Armin J. (CDC); Brooks, Michael5; Brooks, Michael D. (ATSDR); Brozowski, George; Buzzell, Jennifer J. (CDC); Charp, Paul (ATSDR); Cherniack, James; ATeam-CLEVELAND, GORDON; Connell, Carol (ATSDR); Cunningham, William C; DeCair, Sara; ATeam-DENNISON, KEVIN; Dixon, John E. (CDC); Funk, Renee H. (CDC); Goodman, Roger; Hansen, Patricia A; Hargrave, Scotty L; Hooper, Charles A.; Hornsby-Myers, Jennifer L. (CDC); ATeam-HOUVENER, GERALD; Jablonowski, Eugene; ATeam-JENSEN, JOHN; Jones, Terri; Keith, Sam (ATSDR); Lotz, William G. (CDC); ATeam-Lough, Scott; Maher, Carmen; Miller, Charles W. (CDC); Noska, Michael A; ATeam-PAVEK, JOHN; Russo, Mark; Sincek, Jeffrey; Veal, Lee; Whitcomb, Robert (CDC); Mitchell, James; Mosser, Jennifer; Clark, Ray; Fraass, Ron; 'Popell.Sam@epa.gov'; ATeam-BRANDON, LOU; Dempsey, Gregg D.; Morrison, Ellen F; Smallwood, Karen R
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Kickoff Webinar: Peer Review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (Schedule Changes)

Dear Advisory Team members:

I am lazily piggybacking on Terry Kraus' message to inform you that Harvey Clark has released an update to the Nuclear Power Plant briefing products and that he would like our review and comments. As indicated below, Harvey has organized a webinar for Wednesday to kick off this

round of review. I hope that many or most of you will be able to participate. Sorry to those of you who have received this message already from other sources.

Thanks!

Mike

Michael A. Noska, M.S.
Captain, USPHS
Senior Advisor for Health Physics
Employee Safety and Environmental Management Staff
Office of the Commissioner/Office of Operations
Food and Drug Administration
301-796-8313 (Office)
301-526-7956 (Cell)

From: Kraus, Terrence D [mailto:tdkraus@sandia.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 1:17 PM
To: Howe, Michael; Beal, Bill; Blumenthal, Dan; Bowman, Dave; Boyd, Wesley; Brandon, Lou; Brenda Pobanz (pobanz2@llnl.gov); Cherniack, James; Clark, Harvey; ATeam-CLEVELAND, GORDON; Corredor, Carlos; Costello, Cynthiea A.; Cunningham, William; Decair, Sara; Favret, Derek; Guss, Paul; Hale, Alan C ; Homann, Steve; Hoover, Sarah C. (LANL); Hunt, Brian; Jensen, John; Jones, Greg (jones88@llnl.gov); Kowalczik, Jeff; Kraus, Terrence D; Laiche, Thomas P; Luke, Stephen; ATeam-MENA, RAJAH; Morgan, Ronald G. (LANL); ATeam-Mosser, Jennifer; Murray, Michael; Nasstrom, John; Nickel, Lee A.; Noska, Michael A; ATeam-PEMBERTON, WENDY; Reed, Alexis; Riland, Carson; Rogers, Jeremy; Royce, Christopher; Shanks, Arthur; Walker, Doug; Ward,Paul; Whitcomb, Robert (CDC); Yu, Charley; Yu, Kristen L.
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Kickoff Webinar: Peer Review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (Schedule Changes)

Hello AWG Members,

Harvey Clark has continued to lead a subgroup to improve the Briefing Products (BPs) for nuclear power plant accidents and he would like our comments on the latest version (Version 8) of the BPs.

The briefing products are included in the 2 attached emails. One email includes the BPs for the NPP reactor and the other email includes the BPs for the spent fuel.

Please send your comments to Harvey at CLARKHW@nv.doe.gov.

Please see the information below for more information on the review of the BPs.

Also, Harvey has scheduled at webinar for December 18 to discuss the briefing products. Please see the email from Harvey below that provides Webinar information.

Thank you.

Terry Kraus

Nuclear Incident Response Programs

Sandia National Laboratories

(505) 284-9708

Invitation to Review & Comment

Version 8 of the proposed Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Briefing Products is ready for review and comment. This version reflects the 78 comments on Version 6 (*Version 7 not distributed for external review*). Comments were received from:

- □□□□□□□□ FRMAC Assessment Working Group,
- □□□□□□□□ FRMAC Operations Working Group,
- □□□□□□□□ Advisory Team for the Environment, Food, and Health,
- □□□□□□□□ Inter-agency Modeling and Atmospheric Assessment Center (IMAAC) Steering Group,
- □□□□□□□□ DOE Office or Emergency Operations (NA-42).

This review must consider the content and use of the Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Briefing

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Discussion Webinar

Please review Version 8 of the Nuclear Power Plant Briefing Products and plan to participate in a Webinar to discussion them. The goal of this discussion is to establish the specifications for creation of the next version of the NPP Briefing Products.

Distribution of Review materials

Two sets of Version 8 NPP Briefing Products are being distributed for review and discussion. One reflects a release from a nuclear reactor (dominated by noble gases and radio-iodine). The other set reflects the release from a fuel pool fire (dominated by radio-cesium). Each set will be distributed separately due to the size of the files and limitation of some email systems.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

We eagerly await your comments and participation in the webinars.

Thank you in advance for your time, consideration and assistance.

Respectfully,

•□□□□□□□□ **Harvey Clark** (Remote Sensing Laboratory) , 702-295-8642, ClarkHW@nv.doe.gov

•□□□□□□□□ **Kristen Yu** (NARAC, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), 925-422-8331, Yu27@llnl.gov

From: Clark, Harvey [mailto:CLARKHW@nv.doe.gov]
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2013 10:30 AM
To: Blumenthal, Dan; Honaker, Ricky L. (NEV); Kraus, Terrence D; Noska, Michael A; Grose, Andy M.E. CIV
Cc: Yu, Kristen L.; Brooke Buddemeier (Buddemeier1@llnl.gov); John Nasstrom (jnasstrom@llnl.gov)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Kickoff Webinar: Peer Review of NPP Briefing Products - Version 8 (Schedule Changes)

Schedule Changes:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sorry for changes and confusion.

Kick-Off Discussion: Peer Review of

Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Briefing Products - Version 8

Join us for a Webinar on Wednesday, December 18 at 2PM EST

Register now:
https://www4.gotomeeting.com/register/673828095
We will have a short kick-off discussion to begin the review and comment period for Version 8 of the proposed Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Briefing Products, Wednesday, December 18 at 2PM EST (11 AM PST). This is a date/time change for the meeting announced in the first message (19 Dec).

The GoToMeeting announcement previously distributed (January 16) is cancelled but will be rescheduled to close out the review and comment period (closing Jan 15). Expect a new GoToMeeting announcement closer to that date.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Title: *Kick-Off Discussion: Peer Review of Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Briefing Products - Version 8*
Date: Wednesday, December 18, 2013
Time: 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM PST

After registering you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the Webinar.

Dr. Harvey W. Clark Jr. (Contractor)

Senior Fellow, Remote Sensing Laboratory

Operated by National Security Technologies

Office: 702 295 8642

Cell: 702 525-8331

FAX: 702 295-8648

E-mail: ClarkHW@nv.doe.gov

National Security Technologies

P.O. Box 89521, M/S RSL-09

Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521